

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed July 16, 2008. Claims 55, 60, and 68-74 are canceled, claims 34, 54, 56-58, 61, 64, 65, and 67 are amended. Claims 34, 54, 56-59, and 61-67 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicants' remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claims. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claims and the cited references. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants' understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

I. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejects claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Miki* (United States Patent No. 6,101,339). Because *Miki* does not teach or suggest each and every element of the rejected claims, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the following remarks.

Amended claim 34 recites, in combination with other elements, an external image capturing apparatus and a strobe apparatus, "wherein the strobe apparatus is configured to send an identifier to the external image-capturing apparatus, the identifier indicating a type of the external strobe; and wherein the external capture apparatus is configured to evaluate the identifier and to enter one of an image capture mode and an image display mode according to a validity of the identifier."

The cited references fail to teach or suggest such an apparatus. *Miki* teaches a camera including two parts, “a main device; a unit detachable from the main device.” Col. 3, lns. 24-25. *Miki* only describes the following as being transferred between the devices: electrical power (Col. 3, lns. 29-30), image data (Col. 5, lns. 24-28), and an instruction to emit a flash (Col. 9, lns. 38-42). However, there is no teaching or suggestion of passing an “identifier indicating a type of external strobe.” There is further no teaching or suggestion of either the detachable unit or main device entering “one of an image capture mode and an image display mode according to a validity of the identifier.”

Ogasawara likewise fails to disclose such an apparatus. *Ogasawara* has been cited as showing a strobe that transmits information to a camera such as that “the automatic flash control photographing mode is set” and that “preliminary light emission synchronous signal is requested.” Col. 27, lns. 13-15. However, none of these communications indicate a *type* of the external strobe. They only relate to the current status or operating condition of the strobe. Furthermore, *Ogasawara* does not describe a camera that enters “one of an image capture mode and an image display mode according to a validity of the identifier” in response to the cited communications from the strobe.

Since the cited references do not teach the apparatus claimed, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

B. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 54, 58, 59, 61, 63, 73, and 74 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Miki* (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,339).

Claims 54 is dependent on allowable claim 34 for at least the reasons discussed hereinabove.

With respect to claim 58, *Miki* fails to teach or suggest, in combination with the other elements of the claim, a camera and an external strobe “wherein the external strobe is of at least one type of external strobe; and wherein the external strobe is configured to send an identifier to the camera, the identifier indicating the at least one type of external strobe; and wherein the camera is configured to evaluate the identifier and to enter one of an image capture mode and an image display mode according to a validity of the identifier.”

As noted above, *Miki* discloses a main unit and a detachable unit having transferred therebetween electrical power (Col. 3, lns. 29-30), image data (Col. 5, lns. 24-28), and an instruction to emit a flash (Col. 9, lns. 38-42). The device disclosed does not perform any function corresponding to sending an identifier of “at least one type of external strobe” and entering “one of an image capture mode and an image display mode according to a validity of the identifier” as recited in claim 58.

Claims 59, 61, and 63 are dependent on claim 58 and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed hereinabove.

Claims 73-74 have been canceled rendering their rejection moot.

The Examiner rejects claims 55-57, 60, and 64-67 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Miki* (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,339) in view of *Ogasawara* (U.S. Patent No. 6,295,413).

Claim 34 has been amended to incorporate the elements of claim 55. As noted above, *Ogasawara* has been cited as showing a strobe that transmits information to a camera such as that “the automatic flash control photographing mode is set” and that “preliminary light emission synchronous signal is requested.” Col. 27, lns. 13-15. However, as also noted above, none of these communications are an identifier indicating a type of an external strobe. They only relate to the current status or operating condition of the strobe.

With respect to claim 56, in view of the insufficiency of *Ogasawara* with respect to claim 55 (now part of claim 34), it further fails to show an apparatus that is “configured to receive an acknowledgement of the identifier from the external image-capturing apparatus.” Inasmuch as no identifier according to claim 55 is sent, no acknowledgement of such an identifier is received or sent as recited in claim 56. With respect to claim 57, for similar reasons, *Ogasawara* does not disclose an apparatus configured to commence supplying power to the external image-capturing apparatus after receiving the acknowledgement.”

Claim 60 has been canceled and its language incorporated into claim 58. As already noted with respect to claim 34, the communications between the camera and strobe described by *Ogasawara* relate only to the status and operating condition of a strobe and do not include any identifier of the type of strobe. The device of *Ogasawara* is therefore not described as being “configured to send an identifier to the camera, the identifier indicating the at least one type of

external strobe” as recited in amended claim 58.

With respect to claim 64, the cited references, whether alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest, in combination with the other elements of the claim, a camera and an external strobe, wherein the external strobe is “connected to the camera [and] configured to send an identifier to the camera, the identifier *indicating the at least one type of external strobe*; wherein the camera is configured to *evaluate the identifier and to enter one of an image capture mode and an image display mode according to a validity of the identifier.*”

As noted above, the information transmitted between the strobe and camera in *Ogasawara* does not include an identifier, such as might indicate “the at least one type of external strobe.” The data transmitted in *Ogasawara* relates only to the status and operating conditions of the strobe. The camera in *Ogasawara* further does not evaluate an identifier, such as is recited in the claim, or “enter one of an image capture mode and an image display mode according to a validity of the identifier.”

With respect to claims 65 and 66, inasmuch as *Ogasawara* does not disclose the identifier as recited in claim 64, it also further fails to disclose an “external strobe is configured to receive *an acknowledgement of the identifier* from the camera” and an “external strobe ... configured to commence supplying power to the camera after receiving the acknowledgement.”

Claim 67 is dependent on allowable claim 64 and is therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed hereinabove.

The Examiner rejects claim 62 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Miki* (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,339) in view of *Reitmaa* (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,843). *Reitmaa* has been cited as showing a camera coupled to a mobile phone. However, *Reitmaa* fails to remedy the above noted deficiencies of *Miki* with respect to claim 58, upon which claim 62 depends. Inasmuch as claim 62 is dependent on allowable claim 58 it is therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed hereinabove.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any of the following fees that may be applicable to this communication, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-3178: (1) any filing fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16; (2) any patent application and reexamination processing fees under 37 CFR § 1.17; and/or (3) any post issuance fees under 37 CFR § 1.20. In addition, if any additional extension of time is required, which has not otherwise been requested, please consider this a petition therefor and charge any additional fees that may be required to Deposit Account No. 23-3178.

Dated this 16th day of October 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/R. Burns Israelsen/ Reg. No. 42685

R. BURNS ISRAELSEN
Registration No. 42,685
Attorney for Applicants
Customer No. 022913
Telephone No. 801-533-9800